

REMARKS

The Applicant has received and reviewed the Official Action dated 1 March 2006 (the "Action"), and submits this paper as a fully-responsive reply thereto. The Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this Application based on the above claim amendments and the following remarks.

At the outset, the undersigned would like to thank Examiner Meislin for the courtesies extended to the Applicant during a telephone interview on or around 5 May 2006. The parties discussed possible revisions to independent claims 1, 8, and 16, but no final agreement regarding allowance of the claims was reached. However, the parties did discuss the possibility of the Office contacting the undersigned in the event that further clarifications might place the claims in better condition for allowance.

A review of the claims indicates that:

Claims 1-20 were originally submitted.

Claims 1, 8, and 16 are currently amended.

Claims 1, 8, 16, and 18-20 remain pending.

As stated on Paragraph 1 on Page 2 of the Final Action, claims 1, 8, and 18-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Turning to **independent claim 1**, the Applicant has amended claim 1 as indicated above to clarify the recitation of the hand tool. For convenience, the Applicant reproduces claim 1 as revised above, with redlines included:

1 “1. (**Currently Amended**) A ~~one-piece~~ multi-purpose hand tool, comprising:

2 ...

3 wherein the ~~tool~~ socket body, the key tip, and the arm portion include[[s]] a
4 material selected from the group consisting of metal, metal alloys, steel and steel
5 alloys.”

6 In light of the above clarification, the Applicant requests reconsideration
7 and withdrawal of the § 112, 2nd paragraph, rejection of claim 1.

8 Turning to **independent claim 8**, the Applicant has amended claim 8 to
9 clarify the recitation of the hand tool. The revisions to claim 8 are similar to the
10 revisions discussed above with claim 1, so the above comments directed to claim 1
11 apply equally to claim 8. The Applicant thus requests reconsideration and
12 withdrawal of the § 112, 2nd paragraph, rejection of claim 8.

13 Turning to **independent claim 16**, the Applicant has amended claim 16 as
14 indicated above to clarify the recitation of the set of tools. For convenience of
15 discussion, the Applicant reproduces here a portion of claim 16, with redlines
16 shown:

17 “16. (**Currently Amended**) A set of tools, comprising:

18 ...

19 at least a second tool including that is identical to the first tool, wherein
20 ~~the second tool includes a~~ second socket body ...;

21 ...;

22 wherein the first socket body, the first key tip, and the first arm portion
23 of the first tool include a material selected from the group consisting of metal,
24 metal alloys, steel and steel alloys;
25

1 ...; and

2 wherein the second socket body, the second key tip, and the second arm
3 portion of the second tool include a material selected from the group consisting
4 of metal, metal alloys, steel and steel alloys; and "

5
6 The features added to claim 16 are similar to the revisions made to claims 1
7 and 8 as discussed above. In light of the above revisions and comments, the
8 Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 112, 2nd paragraph,
9 rejection of claim 16 and all claims depending therefrom.

10 As stated in Paragraph 2 on Page 3 of the Action, claims 16 and 18-20
11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 1st paragraph, as failing to comply with the
12 written description requirement. In light of the above clarifications to independent
13 claim 16, the Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 112, 1st
14 paragraph, rejection of claims 16 and 18-20.

15 The Applicant appreciates that indication in Paragraph 3, on Page 3 of the
16 Action, that claims 1 and 8 may be given favorable consideration if the rejections
17 under § 112, 2nd paragraph, are overcome. In light of the above clarifications and
18 comments, the Applicant requests favorable action on all claims pending in this
19 case.

1 **Conclusion**

2 The Applicant requests favorable action on this matter at the earliest
3 convenience of the Office. If personal discussion would advance prosecution of
4 this matter, the Office is invited to contact the undersigned to schedule a telephone
5 interview.

6
7 Respectfully Submitted,

8
9 Dated: 26 MAY 06

By: 

Rocco L. Adornato
Reg. No. 40,480
Attorney for Applicant

LEE & HAYES PLLC
Suite 500
421 W. Riverside Avenue
Spokane, Washington 99201
Telephone: 509-324-9256 x257
Facsimile: (509) 323-8979